

DRUG-FREE COMMUNITIES ACT OF 1997

MAY 20, 1997.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, from the Committee on Government Reform Oversight, and submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 956]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 956) to amend the National Narcotics Leadership Act of 1988 to establish a program to support and encourage local communities that first demonstrate a comprehensive, long-term commitment to reduce substance abuse among youth, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

CONTENTS

	Page
I. Purpose and Summary	8
II. Background and Need for the Legislation	9
III. Legislative Hearings and Committee Action	12
IV. Oversight Findings	14
V. Explanation of Bill	16
VI. Compliance with Rule XI	24
VII. Statement of CBO Cost Estimate	24
VIII. Statement of Constitutional Authority	26
IX. Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), Section 5(b)	26
X. Changes in Existing Law	27
XI. Congressional Accountability Act; Public Law 104-1	36
XII. Budget Analysis	37
XIII. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act; Public Law 104-4, Section 423	37
XIV. Appendix	37

The amendment is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Drug-Free Communities Act of 1997”.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The National Narcotics Leadership Act of 1988 (21 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by inserting between sections 1001 and 1002 the following:

“CHAPTER 1—OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY”;

and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“CHAPTER 2—DRUG-FREE COMMUNITIES

“SEC. 1021. FINDINGS.

“Congress finds the following:

“(1) Substance abuse among youth has more than doubled in the 5-year period preceding 1996, with substantial increases in the use of marijuana, inhalants, cocaine, methamphetamine, LSD, and heroin.

“(2) The most dramatic increases in substance abuse has occurred among 13- and 14-year-olds.

“(3) Casual or periodic substance abuse by youth today will contribute to hard core or chronic substance abuse by the next generation of adults.

“(4) Substance abuse is at the core of other problems, such as rising violent teenage and violent gang crime, increasing health care costs, HIV infections, teenage pregnancy, high school dropouts, and lower economic productivity.

“(5) Increases in substance abuse among youth are due in large part to an erosion of understanding by youth of the high risks associated with substance abuse, and to the softening of peer norms against use.

“(6)(A) Substance abuse is a preventable behavior and a treatable disease; and

“(B)(i) during the 13-year period beginning with 1979, monthly use of illegal drugs among youth 12 to 17 years of age declined by over 70 percent; and

“(ii) data suggests that if parents would simply talk to their children regularly about the dangers of substance abuse, use among youth could be expected to decline by as much as 30 percent.

“(7) Community anti-drug coalitions throughout the United States are successfully developing and implementing comprehensive, long-term strategies to reduce substance abuse among youth on a sustained basis.

“(8) Intergovernmental cooperation and coordination through national, State, and local or tribal leadership and partnerships are critical to facilitate the reduction of substance abuse among youth in communities throughout the United States.

“SEC. 1022. PURPOSES.

“The purposes of this chapter are—

“(1) to reduce substance abuse among youth in communities throughout the United States, and over time, to reduce substance abuse among adults;

“(2) to strengthen collaboration among communities, the Federal Government, and State, local, and tribal governments;

“(3) to enhance intergovernmental cooperation and coordination on the issue of substance abuse among youth;

“(4) to serve as a catalyst for increased citizen participation and greater collaboration among all sectors and organizations of a community that first demonstrates a long-term commitment to reducing substance abuse among youth;

“(5) to rechannel resources from the fiscal year 1998 Federal drug control budget to provide technical assistance, guidance, and financial support to communities that demonstrate a long-term commitment in reducing substance abuse among youth;

“(6) to disseminate to communities timely information regarding the state-of-the-art practices and initiatives that have proven to be effective in reducing substance abuse among youth;

“(7) to enhance, not supplant, local community initiatives for reducing substance abuse among youth; and

“(8) to encourage the creation of and support for community anti-drug coalitions throughout the United States.

“SEC. 1023. DEFINITIONS.

“In this chapter:

“(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ‘Administrator’ means the Administrator appointed by the Director under section 1031(c).

“(2) **ADVISORY COMMISSION.**—The term ‘Advisory Commission’ means the Advisory Commission established under section 1041.

“(3) **COMMUNITY.**—The term ‘community’ shall have the meaning provided that term by the Administrator, in consultation with the Advisory Commission.

“(4) **DIRECTOR.**—The term ‘Director’ means the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

“(5) **ELIGIBLE COALITION.**—The term ‘eligible coalition’ means a coalition that meets the applicable criteria under section 1032(a).

“(6) **GRANT RECIPIENT.**—The term ‘grant recipient’ means the recipient of a grant award under section 1032.

“(7) **NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION.**—The term ‘nonprofit organization’ means an organization described under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(8) **PROGRAM.**—The term ‘Program’ means the program established under section 1031(a).

“(9) **SUBSTANCE ABUSE.**—The term ‘substance abuse’ means—

“(A) the illegal use or abuse of drugs, including substances listed in schedules I through V of section 112 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 812);

“(B) the abuse of inhalants; or

“(C) the use of alcohol, tobacco, or other related product as such use is prohibited by State or local law.

“(10) **YOUTH.**—The term ‘youth’ shall have the meaning provided that term by the Administrator, in consultation with the Advisory Commission.

“SEC. 1024. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Office of National Drug Control Policy to carry out this chapter—

“(1) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1998;

“(2) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 1999;

“(3) \$30,000,000 for fiscal year 2000;

“(4) \$40,000,000 for fiscal year 2001; and

“(5) \$43,500,000 for fiscal year 2002.

“(b) **ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.**—Not more than the following percentages of the amounts authorized under subsection (a) may be used to pay administrative costs:

“(1) 10 percent for fiscal year 1998.

“(2) 6 percent for fiscal year 1999.

“(3) 4 percent for fiscal year 2000.

“(4) 3 percent for fiscal year 2001.

“(5) 3 percent for fiscal year 2002.

“Subchapter I—Drug-Free Communities Support Program

“SEC. 1031. ESTABLISHMENT OF DRUG-FREE COMMUNITIES SUPPORT PROGRAM.

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Director shall establish a program to support communities in the development and implementation of comprehensive, long-term plans and programs to prevent and treat substance abuse among youth.

“(b) **PROGRAM.**—In carrying out the Program, the Director shall—

“(1) make and track grants to grant recipients;

“(2) provide for technical assistance and training, data collection, and dissemination of information on state-of-the-art practices that the Director determines to be effective in reducing substance abuse; and

“(3) provide for the general administration of the Program.

“(c) **ADMINISTRATION.**—Not later than 30 days after receiving recommendations from the Advisory Commission under section 1042(a)(1), the Director shall appoint an Administrator to carry out the Program.

“(d) **CONTRACTING.**—The Director may employ any necessary staff and may enter into contracts or agreements with national drug control agencies, including inter-agency agreements to delegate authority for the execution of grants and for such other activities necessary to carry out this chapter.

“SEC. 1032. PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION.

“(a) **GRANT ELIGIBILITY.**—To be eligible to receive an initial grant or a renewal grant under this subchapter, a coalition shall meet each of the following criteria:

“(1) **APPLICATION.**—The coalition shall submit an application to the Administrator in accordance with section 1033(a)(2).

“(2) **MAJOR SECTOR INVOLVEMENT.**—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The coalition shall consist of 1 or more representatives of each of the following categories:

- “(i) Youth.
- “(ii) Parents.
- “(iii) Businesses.
- “(iv) The media.
- “(v) Schools.
- “(vi) Organizations serving youth.
- “(vii) Law enforcement.
- “(viii) Religious organizations.
- “(ix) Civic, volunteer, and fraternal groups.
- “(x) Health care professionals.
- “(xi) State, local, or tribal governmental agencies with expertise in the field of substance abuse (including, if applicable, the State authority with primary authority for substance abuse).
- “(xii) Other organizations involved in reducing substance abuse.

“(B) ELECTED OFFICIALS.—If feasible, in addition to representatives from the categories listed in subparagraph (A), the coalition shall have an elected official (or a representative of an elected official) from—

- “(i) the Federal Government; and
- “(ii) the government of the appropriate State and political subdivision thereof or the governing body or an Indian tribe (as that term is defined in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e))).

“(C) REPRESENTATION.—An individual who is a member of the coalition may serve on the coalition as a representative of not more than 1 category listed under subparagraph (A).

“(3) COMMITMENT.—The coalition shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Administrator—

“(A) that the representatives of the coalition have worked together on substance abuse reduction initiatives, which, at a minimum, includes initiatives that target drugs referenced in section 1023(9)(A), for a period of not less than 6 months, acting through entities such as task forces, subcommittees, or community boards; and

“(B) substantial participation from volunteer leaders in the community involved (especially in cooperation with individuals involved with youth such as parents, teachers, coaches, youth workers, and members of the clergy).

“(4) MISSION AND STRATEGIES.—The coalition shall, with respect to the community involved—

“(A) have as its principal mission the reduction of substance abuse, which, at a minimum, includes the use and abuse of drugs referenced in section 1023(9)(A), in a comprehensive and long-term manner, with a primary focus on youth in the community;

“(B) describe and document the nature and extent of the substance abuse problem, which, at a minimum, includes the use and abuse of drugs referenced in section 1023(9)(A), in the community;

“(C)(i) provide a description of substance abuse prevention and treatment programs and activities, which, at a minimum, includes programs and activities relating to the use and abuse of drugs referenced in section 1023(9)(A), in existence at the time of the grant application; and

“(ii) identify substance abuse programs and service gaps, which, at a minimum, includes programs and gaps relating to the use and abuse of drugs referenced in section 1023(9)(A), in the community;

“(D) develop a strategic plan to reduce substance abuse among youth, which, at a minimum, includes the use and abuse of drugs referenced in section 1023(9)(A), in a comprehensive and long-term fashion; and

“(E) work to develop a consensus regarding the priorities of the community to combat substance abuse among youth, which, at a minimum, includes the use and abuse of drugs referenced in section 1023(9)(A).

“(5) SUSTAINABILITY.—The coalition shall demonstrate that the coalition is an ongoing concern by demonstrating that the coalition—

“(A) is—

“(i)(I) a nonprofit organization; or

“(II) an entity that the Administrator determines to be appropriate;

or

“(ii) part of, or is associated with, an established legal entity;

“(B) receives financial support (including, in the discretion of the Administrator, in-kind contributions) from non-Federal sources; and

“(C) has a strategy to solicit substantial financial support from non-Federal sources to ensure that the coalition and the programs operated by the coalition are self-sustaining.

“(6) ACCOUNTABILITY.—The coalition shall—

“(A) establish a system to measure and report outcomes—

“(i) consistent with common indicators and evaluation protocols established by the Administrator; and

“(ii) approved by the Administrator;

“(B) conduct—

“(i) for an initial grant under this subchapter, an initial benchmark survey of drug use among youth (or use local surveys or performance measures available or accessible in the community at the time of the grant application); and

“(ii) biennial surveys (or incorporate local surveys in existence at the time of the evaluation) to measure the progress and effectiveness of the coalition; and

“(C) provide assurances that the entity conducting an evaluation under this paragraph, or from which the coalition receives information, has experience—

“(i) in gathering data related to substance abuse among youth; or

“(ii) in evaluating the effectiveness of community anti-drug coalitions.

“(b) GRANT AMOUNTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) GRANTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (iv), for a fiscal year, the Administrator may grant to an eligible coalition under this paragraph, an amount not to exceed the amount of non-Federal funds raised by the coalition, including in-kind contributions, for that fiscal year.

“(ii) SUSPENSION OF GRANTS.—If such grant recipient fails to continue to meet the criteria specified in subsection (a), the Administrator may suspend the grant, after providing written notice to the grant recipient and an opportunity to appeal.

“(iii) RENEWAL GRANTS.—Subject to clause (iv), the Administrator may award a renewal grant to a grant recipient under this subparagraph for each fiscal year following the fiscal year for which an initial grant is awarded, in an amount not to exceed the amount of non-Federal funds raised by the coalition, including in-kind contributions, for that fiscal year, during the 4-year period following the period of the initial grant.

“(iv) LIMITATION.—The amount of a grant award under this subparagraph may not exceed \$100,000 for a fiscal year.

“(B) COALITION AWARDS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the Administrator may, with respect to a community, make a grant to 1 eligible coalition that represents that community.

“(ii) EXCEPTION.—The Administrator may make a grant to more than 1 eligible coalition that represents a community if—

“(I) the eligible coalitions demonstrate that the coalitions are collaborating with one another; and

“(II) each of the coalitions has independently met the requirements set forth in subsection (a).

“(2) RURAL COALITION GRANTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In addition to awarding grants under paragraph (1), to stimulate the development of coalitions in sparsely populated and rural areas, the Administrator, in consultation with the Advisory Commission, may award a grant in accordance with this section to a coalition that represents a county with a population that does not exceed 30,000 individuals. In awarding a grant under this paragraph, the Administrator may waive any requirement under subsection (a) if the Administrator considers that waiver to be appropriate.

“(ii) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—Subject to subparagraph (C), for a fiscal year, the Administrator may grant to an eligible coalition under this paragraph, an amount not to exceed the amount of non-Federal funds raised by the coalition, including in-kind contributions, for that fiscal year.

“(iii) **SUSPENSION OF GRANTS.**—If such grant recipient fails to continue to meet any criteria specified in subsection (a) that has not been waived by the Administrator pursuant to clause (i), the Administrator may suspend the grant, after providing written notice to the grant recipient and an opportunity to appeal.

“(B) **RENEWAL GRANTS.**—The Administrator may award a renewal grant to an eligible coalition that is a grant recipient under this paragraph for each fiscal year following the fiscal year for which an initial grant is awarded, in an amount not to exceed the amount of non-Federal funds raised by the coalition, including in-kind contributions, during the 4-year period following the period of the initial grant.

“(C) **LIMITATIONS.**—

“(i) **AMOUNT.**—The amount of a grant award under this paragraph shall not exceed \$100,000 for a fiscal year.

“(ii) **AWARDS.**—With respect to a county referred to in subparagraph (A), the Administrator may award a grant under this section to not more than 1 eligible coalition that represents the county.

“SEC. 1033. INFORMATION COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION WITH RESPECT TO GRANT RECIPIENTS.

“(a) **COALITION INFORMATION.**—

“(1) **GENERAL AUDITING AUTHORITY.**—For the purpose of audit and examination, the Administrator—

“(A) shall have access to any books, documents, papers, and records that are pertinent to any grant or grant renewal request under this chapter; and

“(B) may periodically request information from a grant recipient to ensure that the grant recipient meets the applicable criteria under section 1032(a).

“(2) **APPLICATION PROCESS.**—The Administrator shall issue a request for proposal regarding, with respect to the grants awarded under section 1032, the application process, grant renewal, and suspension or withholding of renewal grants. Each application under this paragraph shall be in writing and shall be subject to review by the Administrator.

“(3) **REPORTING.**—The Administrator shall, to the maximum extent practicable and in a manner consistent with applicable law, minimize reporting requirements by a grant recipient and expedite any application for a renewal grant made under this subchapter.

“(b) **DATA COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator may collect data from—

“(A) national substance abuse organizations that work with eligible coalitions, community anti-drug coalitions, departments or agencies of the Federal Government, or State or local governments and the governing bodies of Indian tribes; and

“(B) any other entity or organization that carries out activities that relate to the purposes of the Program.

“(2) **ACTIVITIES OF ADMINISTRATOR.**—The Administrator may—

“(A) evaluate the utility of specific initiatives relating to the purposes of the Program;

“(B) conduct an evaluation of the Program; and

“(C) disseminate information described in this subsection to—

“(i) eligible coalitions and other substance abuse organizations; and

“(ii) the general public.

“SEC. 1034. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

“(1) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND AGREEMENTS.**—With respect to any grant recipient or other organization, the Administrator may—

“(A) offer technical assistance and training; and

“(B) enter into contracts and cooperative agreements.

“(2) **COORDINATION OF PROGRAMS.**—The Administrator may facilitate the coordination of programs between a grant recipient and other organizations and entities.

“(b) **TRAINING.**—The Administrator may provide training to any representative designated by a grant recipient in—

“(1) coalition building;

“(2) task force development;

“(3) mediation and facilitation, direct service, assessment and evaluation; or

“(4) any other activity related to the purposes of the Program.

“Subchapter II—Advisory Commission

“SEC. 1041. ESTABLISHMENT OF ADVISORY COMMISSION.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a commission to be known as the ‘Advisory Commission on Drug-Free Communities’.

“(b) PURPOSE.—The Advisory Commission shall advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Director concerning matters related to the activities carried out under the Program.

“SEC. 1042. DUTIES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Advisory Commission—

“(1) shall, not later than 30 days after its first meeting, make recommendations to the Director regarding the selection of an Administrator;

“(2) may make recommendations to the Director regarding any grant, contract, or cooperative agreement made by the Program;

“(3) may make recommendations to the Director regarding the activities of the Program;

“(4) may make recommendations to the Director regarding any policy or criteria established by the Director to carry out the Program;

“(5) may—

“(A) collect, by correspondence or by personal investigation, information concerning initiatives, studies, services, programs, or other activities of coalitions or organizations working in the field of substance abuse in the United States or any other country; and

“(B) with the approval of the Director, make the information referred to in subparagraph (A) available through appropriate publications or other methods for the benefit of eligible coalitions and the general public; and

“(6) may appoint subcommittees and convene workshops and conferences.

“(b) RECOMMENDATIONS.—If the Director rejects any recommendation of the Advisory Commission under subsection (a)(1), the Director shall notify the Advisory Commission in writing of the reasons for the rejection not later than 15 days after receiving the recommendation.

“(c) CONFLICT OF INTEREST.—A member of the Advisory Commission shall recuse himself or herself from any decision that would constitute a conflict of interest.

“SEC. 1043. MEMBERSHIP.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall appoint 11 members to the Advisory Commission as follows:

“(1) 4 members shall be appointed from the general public and shall include leaders—

“(A) in fields of youth development, public policy, law, or business; or

“(B) of nonprofit organizations or private foundations that fund substance abuse programs.

“(2) 4 members shall be appointed from the leading representatives of national substance abuse reduction organizations, of which no fewer than 3 members shall have extensive training or experience in drug prevention.

“(3) 3 members shall be appointed from the leading representatives of State substance abuse reduction organizations.

“(b) CHAIRPERSON.—The Advisory Commission shall elect a chairperson or co-chairpersons from among its members.

“(c) EX OFFICIO MEMBERS.—The ex officio membership of the Advisory Commission shall consist of any 2 officers or employees of the United States that the Director determines to be necessary for the Advisory Commission to effectively carry out its functions.

“SEC. 1044. COMPENSATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Members of the Advisory Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall not receive any additional compensation for service on the Advisory Commission. The remaining members of the Advisory Commission shall receive, for each day (including travel time) that they are engaged in the performance of the functions of the Advisory Commission, compensation at rates not to exceed the daily equivalent to the annual rate of basic pay payable for grade GS-10 of the General Schedule.

“(b) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Each member of the Advisory Commission shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with sections 5702 and 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

“SEC. 1045. TERMS OF OFFICE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the term of office of a member of the Advisory Commission shall be 3 years, except that, as designated at the time of appointment—

“(1) of the initial members appointed under section 1043(a)(1), 2 shall be appointed for a term of 2 years;

“(2) of the initial members appointed under section 1043(a)(2), 2 shall be appointed for a term of 2 years; and

“(3) of the initial members appointed under section 1043(a)(3), 1 shall be appointed for a term of 1 year.

“(b) VACANCIES.—Any member appointed to fill a vacancy for an unexpired term of a member shall serve for the remainder of the unexpired term. A member of the Advisory Commission may serve after the expiration of such member’s term until a successor has been appointed and taken office.

“SEC. 1046. MEETINGS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—After its initial meeting, the Advisory Commission shall meet, with the advanced approval of the Administrator, at the call of the Chairperson (or Co-chairpersons) of the Advisory Commission or a majority of its members or upon the request of the Director or Administrator of the Program.

“(b) QUORUM.—6 members of the Advisory Commission shall constitute a quorum.

“SEC. 1047. STAFF.

“The Administrator shall make available to the Advisory Commission adequate staff, information, and other assistance.

“SEC. 1048. TERMINATION.

“The Advisory Commission shall terminate at the end of fiscal year 2002.”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Each reference in Federal law to subtitle A of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, with the exception of section 1001 of such subtitle, in any provision of law that is in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act shall be deemed to be a reference to chapter 1 of the National Narcotics Leadership Act of 1988 (as so designated by this section).

I. PURPOSE AND SUMMARY

The purpose of H.R. 956, the “Drug-Free Communities Act of 1997,” is to support and encourage local communities that have demonstrated a comprehensive, long-term commitment to reduce substance abuse among young people. The bill establishes within the Office of National Drug Control Policy a program to provide matching grants to communities that have established sustainable and accountable anti-drug efforts involving every major sector of a community. The bill recognizes that local communities must have flexibility to fashion their own solutions to reduce substance abuse. The bill is also designed to bring national and State leadership to local communities in a systematic manner throughout the United States.

The principal features of the bill are as follows:

COMMUNITIES MUST ACT FIRST

In order to receive Federal support, a community must first demonstrate a comprehensive, long-term commitment to address teenage drug abuse through major sector involvement (substantial volunteer participation from youth, parents, businesses, the media, schools, law enforcement, faith leaders, health care professionals and others), a focused mission, and the implementation of strategies to reduce drug abuse.

LEADERSHIP

National, State and local leaders are encouraged to participate in the local community effort.

SUSTAINABILITY

A community must demonstrate that its anti-drug coalition is an on-going concern that has non-Federal financial support to ensure the effort is self-sustaining.

ACCOUNTABILITY

A community must have a system to evaluate the success of its anti-drug coalition efforts, consistent with commonly accepted standards.

COMMUNITY LEADERS AND EXPERTS OVERSEE THE PROGRAM

An Advisory Commission consisting of local community leaders and national and State experts in the field of substance abuse oversee the implementation of the program at the Office of National Drug Control Policy to ensure the program continues to be responsive to local needs.

II. BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

A. YOUTH SUBSTANCE ABUSE

All recent studies have confirmed that teen drug abuse is a substantial problem. Data from the National Parents Resource Institute for Drug Education (PRIDE) released in 1996 shows one in four high school seniors using illicit drugs at least once a month; one in five using illicit drugs once a week; and one in ten using illicit drugs daily. The 1996 data on cocaine, hallucinogens, inhalants, and marijuana were the highest reported since PRIDE studies began in 1988.

The National Household Survey, conducted by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), confirms that these frightening rates of usage are part of an increasing trend. During the years 1994 to 1996, illicit drug use by 12–17 year olds rose 78 percent. LSD and hallucinogen use increased by 183 percent and cocaine use increased by 166 percent over those three years.

Research also indicates that parents are not talking to their kids about drugs. The PRIDE study indicates that under 30 percent of children report that their parents talk to them frequently about the dangers of drugs—a decrease of over 25 percent since 1990. A study by the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University (CASA) indicates that 94 percent of parents report talking to their children about drugs, but only 64 percent of teens report that their parents have talked to them about drugs at all.

The CASA study also indicates that 40 percent of parents believe they have little influence over their children's decision to use drugs, blaming outside influences. The PRIDE study indicates that kids whose parents talk to them about drugs use illicit drugs at a lower rate—26.6 percent for those whose parents talk to them versus 35.5 percent for those whose parents do not talk to them.

Teens are not perceiving the risks involved in drug use to the same extent they did just five years ago. The Monitoring the Future Study, conducted by Lloyd Johnson at the University of Michi-

gan, indicates that the numbers of teens who indicate a great risk from using powder cocaine and crack cocaine have both dropped over ten percent among eighth graders and five percent among tenth graders. Similar trends exist for perception of risk in using LSD and marijuana. The CASA study reported that in just one year the number of 12–17 year olds who said they would never try an illegal drug dropped forty percent. The long-term trends presented in the Monitoring the Future Study show a strong inverse correlation between the perception of risk and the rate of use, making these recent statistics particularly disturbing.

The risks of drug use are great, despite the decreased perception of risk. The Drug Abuse Warning Network (DAWN), which reports on drug-related emergency room episodes, shows a 30 percent increase over three years from 1994 to 1996, for 12–17 year olds. The consequences of drug use are putting more teens in hospitals.

The National Institute of Justice Drug Use Forecasting study reports on cocaine and marijuana use by individuals who enter the criminal justice system in cities around the country. Among males age 15 to 20, 22 percent tested positive for cocaine use and 53 percent tested positive for marijuana. Cocaine rates were similar for females while marijuana rates were lower. Among juveniles, those under 15, 41 percent tested positive for marijuana while substantially fewer tested positive for cocaine. Rates for both drugs were higher among juveniles who did not attend school than those who did. At some sites, those not in school were two and one-half times more likely to use cocaine.

Youth drug use is clearly related to health problems, spiraling health care costs and violence. This link extends beyond youth drug use. Other important data sheds light on the costs of drug abuse. The National Institute of Justice 1994 Drug Use Forecasting indicates that 50 percent of homicide and violent crime are drug-related. A 1995 Death Penalty Information Center Survey indicated that U.S. police chiefs believe the way to reduce violent crime is to reduce drug abuse. Data indicates that children who use drugs are two to five times more likely to drop out of school. Approximately one-quarter of all health care costs in the United States are related to substance abuse. More than half of all child and spousal abuse cases are related to substance abuse. Drug abuse is estimated to cost U.S. businesses approximately \$60 billion every year in lost productivity due to absenteeism, accidents and medical claims.

B. COMMUNITY ANTI-DRUG COALITIONS

Community coalitions seem to be one of the most effective demand-side tools to reduce youth drug abuse. By fostering cooperation among all sectors of a community and tailoring solutions to local problems, community coalitions have made substantial progress in selected locales:

1. The General Accounting Office has found community coalitions to be a promising method of addressing youth drug abuse. Its findings are summarized under oversight findings in Section IV of this report.
2. The Miami Coalition, in Miami, FL, has been able to move their population from having one of the highest rates of monthly teen drug use in 1988 to half of the national average for such

monthly use by 1993. In a targeted media campaign, the Miami Coalition decreased usage rates by 55 percent in a two-year period.

3. A program in Little Rock, Arkansas, has reduced the victim crime rate and substantially reduced substance abuse by pregnant women. Little Rock voters have been so pleased with the program that they have actually added a ½ cent sales tax to support and expand the program.

4. In Hattiesburg, Mississippi, Project DREAM implemented youth-focused substance abuse education in subsidized housing, quarterly prevention seminars for new businesses, and school-based programs for recovering teens. They report a marked decline in DUI related-accidents and arrests as a result of their programs.

5. Project Freedom in Wichita, Kansas, implemented a comprehensive community-based initiative that reduced drug-related vehicular deaths by 100 percent over a two-year period. DUI related arrests went down by 35 percent, juvenile drug-related crime dropped 65 percent after a community-supported curfew was imposed, and birth of drug-exposed babies dropped 40 percent.

6. Safe Streets Coalition in Tacoma, Washington has closed down 600 drug-dealing locations with joint efforts of neighborhoods, law enforcement officials and churches.

C. DRUG-FREE COMMUNITIES ACT PROGRAM

The Drug-Free Communities Act applies the solutions developed from the experiences of community coalitions to the problems of teen drug abuse. Direct experience in establishing community-based, anti-drug coalitions, advice of experts in the field of drug prevention and insights gained from previous government programs informed the drafting of this legislation.

This legislation is built on the belief that the local community commitment is absolutely essential to solving the drug problem. It recognizes that community grass-roots action and private sector involvement are the keys to solving our Nation's drug problem. In order to receive a Federal matching grant under this program, communities must first demonstrate a comprehensive, long-term commitment to reducing substance abuse. Experience in the field, good research and common sense tell us that communities which have every major sector involved in implementing strategies to reduce drug abuse are the most effective. This legislation supports those communities that have mobilized youth, parents, businesses, faith leaders, law enforcement, educators and other key sectors working together for at least 6 months with a focused mission and targeted strategies. At a minimum, coalitions must focus their efforts on illicit drugs.

The local community must also demonstrate that there is substantial local will to address the substance abuse problems in that community. Without that local commitment, no program can survive over the long-run. The CSAP Community Partnership Program gave grants to communities that did not always have strong non-Federal financial and other support. During its 6-year life, the CSAP Community Partnership Program has made over 400 grants, typically ranging from \$350,000 to \$700,000, to local community programs; unfortunately, only 137 of the first 252 grant recipients survive today. The Federal Government should be providing impor-

tant early support to communities that will continue to sustain the effort with or without the Federal Government.

Another key aspect of the Drug-Free Communities Act is that it requires the local coalition to have a system of evaluation in place. One of the criticisms of Federal programs that support State and local initiatives has been that such programs lack any accountability. Instead of trying to measure outcomes and conduct evaluations at the Federal level, which would require a large bureaucracy and would not necessarily produce better results, the onus is on the local coalition to establish a system that measures its progress—including outcomes, such as whether teenage drug abuse is declining over time. Those efforts around the country that are making a difference already have good systems of evaluation in place. They have to have such systems in order to justify their continued existence. The question is how such efforts can add value, and a system of performance measures is critical to determining that.

The Federal support provided under this program redirects, at the most, less than three-tenths of 1 percent of existing money from the \$16 billion Federal drug control budget to support, dollar for dollar up to \$100,000 per community, local community efforts. This is another check to ensure that there is local commitment. Not one Federal dollar will be spent under this program without a dollar or more generated by the local community.

To ensure that this program maintains the sophistication to give support only to those efforts that are truly working, while maintaining the flexibility to permit communities to continue to fashion local solutions, an advisory commission is charged with helping to select the administrator and will oversee the program. Local community leaders and experts at the national and State levels in the field of substance abuse prevention and treatment will be able to review grant applications, and policies and criteria relating to the program. Those who are working on the front lines of the drug problem will be able to offer valuable input to those administering the program.

The Drug-Free Communities Act of 1997 redirects Federal drug control policy to help support local communities in the most responsible, sustainable, and cost-effective way. It empowers local communities to address their own problems by incorporating national and State leadership with all major sectors within their community.

III. LEGISLATIVE HEARINGS AND COMMITTEE ACTION

A. HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice held a hearing on March 12, 1997, at which Congressman Rob Portman and Congressman Sander Levin testified as sponsors of the bill. James E. Copple, president and CEO of Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America (CADCA), and Robert Francis, executive director of Regional Youth Adult Substance Abuse Project (RYASAP) based in Bridgeport, CT, also testified in support of the bill. Congressman Charles B. Rangel submitted a written statement for the record in support of the legislation.

Subcommittee Chairman J. Dennis Hastert began the hearing with a statement on the problems facing communities as they ad-

dress the crisis of drug abuse and expressed his support for H.R. 956 as a means to support the efforts of communities as they face this deadly problem. The ranking Minority member of the subcommittee, Thomas M. Barrett attributed the rise in teen drug use to the lack of a strong community position and expressed his support for the bill as a way to deliver the message that drugs are dangerous.

Congressman Rob Portman outlined the important provisions of the bill and the importance of the problem it addresses. The bill rechannels existing resources to support effective community efforts in turning back the increase in teen drug abuse and reversing the increasing belief by teens that drug use is socially acceptable. Congressman Portman labeled this a call to action particularly as it drives the increase in many other social problems. The bill provides incentives for communities to address this problem and supports those programs cost-effectively.

Congressman Sander Levin described the bill's contribution to setting the role of the Federal Government in anti-drug abuse efforts. The Drug-Free Communities Act would express a national commitment, help communities learn from each others activities, and to spark new community efforts. He characterized the bill as a wise re-prioritization of Federal resources. In response to questions from the subcommittee, Congressman Levin described the program as support of communities rather than direction to them, so it would not be duplicative of existing programs.

Mr. Copple stressed that coalitions are necessary so that an organized, coherent effort may be aimed at drug abuse. The Drug-Free Communities Act of 1997 unifies the whole community and provides essential resources to those in the field of drug prevention. Through an emphasis on outcome evaluation and increased participation by elected officials and citizens, this legislation will aid ONDCP in creating a coordinated effort against the drug problem.

Mr. Francis attributed the success of RYASAP to many of the same principles that exist in H.R. 956. First, they focused on offering an entire spectrum of services and established task forces for each stage of the spectrum. Additionally, they strove for sustainability and attempted to achieve a community wide effort. Lastly, they realized young people must be offered meaningful alternatives, and seek long term solutions to their drug problem.

B. COMMITTEE ACTION

The Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice favorably referred An Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute to the bill by voice vote on March 12, 1997, to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

On May 16, 1997, a quorum being present, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight favorably reported the Amendment in the Nature of Substitute to H.R. 956 as amended.

*Committee on Government Reform and Oversight—105th Congress
Rollcall*

Date: May 16, 1997.
Amendment #1.

Description: Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute to H.R. 956.

Offered by: Hon. Rob Portman (OH).

Adopted by Voice Vote.

Date: May 16, 1997.

Amendment #2.

Description: Amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute to H.R. 956, Page 6, line 8, strike “, tobacco,”.

Offered by: Hon. Bob Barr (GA).

Failed by Voice Vote.

Date: May 16, 1997.

Amendment #3.

Description: Amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute to H.R. 956, Page 15, strike lines 16 and 17 (and redesignated the subsequent subclauses accordingly).

Offered by: Hon. Elijah E. Cummings (MD).

Adopted by Voice Vote.

Date: May 16, 1997.

Motion to favorably report H.R. 956, as amended.

Offered by: Hon. Dan Burton (IN).

Adopted by Voice Vote.

IV. OVERSIGHT FINDINGS

Pursuant to rule XI, clause 2(l)(3) and rule X, clauses 2(b)(1) and 4(c)(2), the committee presents the following oversight findings from its own investigation and the work of the General Accounting Office (GAO):

A. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (GAO) FINDINGS

1. A March 1997 U.S. General Accounting Office Report entitled, “Drug Control: Observations on Elements of the Federal Drug Control Strategy” stated, “[r]ecent research demonstrates basically two types of prevention approaches that show promise when use in programs with school-age youths. * * * The second approach involves the use of multiple societal institutions (e.g., schools, families, media and community), working together in collaborative fashion, to achieve a multicomponent approach to prevention * * * ” The report continues, “[c]ommon features of programs using a comprehensive approach included multistrategies to target multiple aspects of youths’ lives, such as the individual, family, peer group, school and community.” The GAO report demonstrates the promise of the comprehensive approach embodied in H.R. 956.

2. GAO found the following features associated with positive outcomes: (1) increasing the awareness of the social influences that promote drug use; (2) modifying societal norms or expectations concerning drug use; and (3) targeting multiple aspects of youths’ lives through the use of school, family, peer, and community factors.

3. The Midwestern Prevention Project, a comprehensive community program, showed a 20- to 40-percent net reduction in use of two drugs by school-age youth over a three year period, according to GAO’s review of recent research.

B. COMMITTEE FINDINGS

During the 104th and 105th Congress, the Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice held several hearings on anti-drug abuse issues. Witnesses at several of the hearings testified to the importance of comprehensive community involvement:

1. "Report from the Front Line: The Drug War in California," September 23, 1996. Mr. Herman Wrice, director of Mantua Against Drugs, trains community representatives to activate their communities to resist the influences of drug abuse. He cited examples of success from Newnan, Georgia; Tupelo, Mississippi; Bangor, Maine; and South Philadelphia.

2. "The Epidemic of Teen Drug Use," September 26, 1996. Congressman Rob Portman testified as to the importance of community efforts in spreading the prevention message citing successful examples of comprehensive community-based coalition in Miami and Cincinnati. He also shared the commitment of over 20 members on each side of the aisle to participate in coalitions in their districts reflecting the importance they place on this issue.

3. "The Epidemic of Teen Drug Use," September 26, 1996. Doug Hall, director of the National Parents Resource Institute for Drug Education ("PRIDE") testified to the effectiveness of comprehensive community-based solutions and the support provided by national organizations like PRIDE.

4. "The Epidemic of Teen Drug Use," September 26, 1996. Dr. William Hansen, president of Tanglewood Research, Inc., a group that develops education materials for substance abuse prevention programs, testified on his concern that there is no effective method of disseminating information about programs that work in communities. He also thinks social influence programs that bring all parts of a society to bear on the problem are the most effective based on his research.

5. "The Epidemic of Teen Drug Use," September 26, 1996. Nelson Cooney, senior vice-president of CADCA, testified on the success of comprehensive coalitions citing examples of law enforcement officials talking to the faith community, the faith community talking to schools, and all sectors involving elected leaders.

6. "Report from the Front Line: The Chicagoland Area's Battle Against Drugs," June 24, 1996. Ken Hinterlong detailed how in Aurora, as an organized neighborhood group, their organization had 600 members who met on a regular basis and formed neighborhood watch patrols. Through meetings with the police department and elected officials, the entire community has a better understanding and has created a friendlier environment with the police. Additionally, residents are calling the police 15 percent more while crime went down 35 percent.

7. "Report from the Front Line: Fort Wayne's Battle Against Drugs," June 24, 1996. Reverend Terna Jordan's Stop the Madness program began in 1992, after a series of teenage deaths. It began with one meeting of 850 members of the community and later came to include a summer camp which taught young people about self-esteem, motivation, and the dangers of drugs and gangs.

He believes that “We, as a community” must stop the larger drug suppliers.

8. “Report from the Front Line: Fort Wayne’s Battle Against Drugs,” June 24, 1996. Andre Patterson’s Simba began as a rites of passage group for young men, but has evolved into a family program, with the schools and churches involved. In Simba everything is learned through the community, and the parents are now involved in their children’s lives as a community.

V. EXPLANATION OF BILL

A. PURPOSES (SEC. 1022)

The bill’s purposes are outlined clearly, but one is worth highlighting. The bill redirects existing resources from the proposed fiscal year 1998 Federal drug control budget to provide the appropriations authorized. The sponsors of the legislation and the committee intend that funding for this program will come from existing Federal drug control dollars. The committee intends that funds for this program will be offset by reductions in other areas funded by the Treasury, Postal Service and General Government appropriations bill. The committee has been working with the Committee on Appropriations and its Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government to accomplish this objective. The principal sponsor of the bill has proposed a number of specific offsets for consideration by appropriators. One possible offset to provide the \$10 million in fiscal year 1998 could be to the Treasury Forfeiture Fund. There is precedent for the Treasury Forfeiture Fund being used to support the national drug control strategy by discouraging youth activities which are related to drugs and by encouraging Federal, State and local cooperation, as this program would do. Another option would be to offset \$10 million from the \$30.8 million requested for laboratory construction for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. The rationale for such an offset would be that the drug budget should not be used for purposes that do not directly relate to drug abuse reduction.

The committee will continue to work with appropriators in future years to identify appropriate offsets from the Federal drug control budget.

B. DEFINITIONS (SEC. 1023)

The bill does not provide a specific definition of “community”. The intention was to enable those with direct experience in the field and who serve on the Advisory Commission to provide guidance to the Director of ONDCP. The intent is to encourage and support the creation of community anti-drug coalitions in every region of the country. The program is flexible enough to give grants to more than one coalition serving a community so long as the coalitions independently meet the criteria of the program and are collaborating with one another. The committee believes every effort should be made to ensure that the program is not funding efforts that are duplicative. Every effort should be made to ensure that coalitions serving communities that are adjacent or in the same region are working in concert with one another.

In developing the definition of “community” the Administrator and the Advisory Commission should consider the need for substance abuse prevention programs to reach into all sectors of society, especially inner cities and impoverished areas. The definition of community should encompass these areas and coalitions should consider their needs in developing missions and strategies.

The bill defines “substance abuse” to include three separate categories of substances: 1) drugs, such as narcotics, depressants, stimulants, hallucinogens and cannabis, that are listed on schedules I through V of the Controlled Substances Act and are regulated under Federal law; 2) inhalants, which are not regulated under the Controlled Substances Act and are only subject to restrictions on the sale to minors in a few states; or 3) products that are prohibited by State or local law, such as the use of alcohol or tobacco by minors. Community anti-drug coalitions in the United States generally target illegal drugs. Some coalitions also include strategies that target teenage inhalant abuse and teenage drinking and smoking. The bill encourages coalitions to take a comprehensive approach to addressing these problems, but requires that any coalition funded under this program must include illegal drugs referenced in (1) in their comprehensive plan.

C. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS (SEC. 1024)

The bill authorizes a smaller amount of appropriations in fiscal year 1998 to ensure that the program is running efficiently before grants are dispersed. The amount is gradually increased in succeeding years, up to \$43.5 million in fiscal year 2002. This is symbolic and represents an attempt to provide up to \$100,000 to every Congressional district in the country. The committee received testimony regarding the very positive impact that small grant awards—even \$3,000–\$5,000—can have on local community efforts. The committee believes in the utility of making a large number of smaller grant awards in addition to the larger grant awards that the Federal Government has traditionally made under similar programs.

D. ESTABLISHMENT OF DRUG-FREE COMMUNITIES SUPPORT PROGRAM (SEC. 1031)

The committee believes that the appointment of the Administrator is one of the most important functions that the Director has under this program. The committee believes that it is vitally important for the Administrator to be responsive to the needs of local communities and to be well received in the substance abuse prevention field at large. The input from the Advisory Commission will be critical to ensuring that the Administrator is someone with the necessary qualifications, management skills and experience in the field of substance abuse to oversee this new program.

The Director of ONDCP has the authority under this section to enter into contracts or agreements with national drug control program agencies to delegate authority for the execution of grants and other functions to carry out the program. Congressmen Barrett and Portman worked to develop this provision with the Administration. One of the purposes of this provision was to ensure that the program was carried out in the most efficient manner possible, using,

where appropriate, existing resources in other national drug control program agencies to provide for the execution of grants and for technical assistance. The committee believes that the Administrator at ONDCP must play an active role in this program to ensure that the program is carried out in accordance with the purposes and intent of the bill. It is understood that an interagency agreement between ONDCP and another national drug control agency will include the terms outlined in the bill and will provide additional provisions consistent with the terms of the bill to ensure proper administration of the program.

The Administrator will use the terms of the interagency agreement to oversee the program and ensure that it is operated and grants are awarded in accordance with the policies and criteria established for the program. The interagency agreement will establish a procedure whereby the Administrator may pre-approve grant awards. The national drug control program agency will inform the Administrator when grants are awarded. In order to address concerns raised about the award of grants from an office within the Executive Office of the President, grant awards will be made by a national drug control program agency pursuant to the terms of the interagency agreement. The Administrator will have the authority to review the grant awards to evaluate compliance or non-compliance with the interagency agreement. The committee notes that grants may be executed using a peer review process.

E. PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION (SEC. 1032)

Eligibility criteria have been established based on the common traits of community efforts that are reducing substance abuse. As the March 1997 GAO report highlights (see Oversight Findings) and other studies have indicated, anti-drug efforts that engage every sector of a community and implement numerous initiatives with proven track records in reducing substance abuse can be very effective. To ensure collaboration with State and local governmental efforts, the criteria also include involvement of State, local or tribal governmental agencies with expertise in the field of substance abuse. The single State authority with primary responsibility for substance abuse should be tied into the local community effort.

Because there is a recognition that the problem of substance abuse ultimately has to be solved at the local community level, the bill attempts to bring national, State and local leadership to local communities throughout the United States. The bill strongly encourages local coalitions to involve their elected officials at the Federal, State and local level, to the extent feasible. The committee notes the "Community Anti-Drug Coalition Initiative" spearheaded by Congressman Rob Portman, which establishes a model for how Members of Congress can establish or help support existing community anti-drug coalitions in the districts they represent. The committee notes that 44 Members of Congress are currently participating in this initiative, and that Members of Congress can help mobilize sectors of a community, bring new leadership and ideas to the effort and help bring the expertise of national substance abuse organizations to a local community.

The bill requires a local community to first demonstrate a strong commitment to reducing substance abuse in their community. Federal funding is generally not available until a local community can demonstrate that its representatives have worked together for at least 6 months in some kind of structured fashion. The committee also recognizes that substantial volunteer participation and community buy-in to the anti-drug effort are critical.

The committee is particularly concerned that the coalition include, both in its membership and in its programming decisions, organizations not traditionally associated with substance abuse programs, but which engage in activities that prevent drug abuse. For example, a Boy Scout organization or a faith-based youth group that works on youth character development would be good candidates for involvement in a coalition.

The bill also requires that a community effort have a focused mission with a principal emphasis on youth. This simply reflects the data which indicates that youth substance abuse is increasing dramatically but also demonstrates that if you can prevent someone from trying illegal drugs before they are 19, then there is about a 90 percent probability they will never have a drug problem. Of current adult cocaine users, for example, nine out of ten started using as teenagers. This criteria also reflects the fact that the key to reducing drug abuse on a sustained basis, generation by generation, is to focus on youth substance abuse. The committee believes that a comprehensive drug prevention effort targeting youth can have the most significant impact on reducing drug abuse in the short and long terms.

The bill requires a demonstration that the local effort can be sustained over the long-term, without Federal support. The committee believes that local efforts and non-Federal financial support are critical to a program's long-term success. The committee wants to maximize the utility of Federal resources so that a smaller amount of Federal support tracks strong local commitment and financial support. The committee believes that the Federal Government should be providing support to those communities that have efforts that are effective and sustainable, not be a substitute for local community effort. It is hoped that Federal financial support will act as a catalyst to enhance what communities are already doing well and to spur the creation of other sustainable community anti-drug efforts.

One of the common and often deserved criticisms of Federal programs that support State and local initiatives is that they lack accountability. This bill requires a coalition applying for a grant to have a system of evaluation in place that measures outcomes, consistent with common indicators. The committee notes that successful community efforts around the country evaluate their progress over time to be sure they are adding value. The committee also notes that is one of the benefits of having the private sector involved in these coalitions—it forces accountability. The committee notes that there are models of evaluation in the field that coalitions are using effectively. Some examples include Hawkins, Catalano & Miller, "Risk and Protective Factors for Alcohol and other Drug Problems in Adolescence and early adulthood: implications for substance abuse prevention," *Psychological Bulletin* 112(1):64–105,

1992; Stephen B. Fawcett, *Work Group Evaluation Handbook: Evaluating and Supporting Community Initiatives for Health and Development*; U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, *Title V Delinquency Prevention Program Community Self-Evaluation Workbook*.

Coalitions have also reported that such systems of evaluation are critical to making their case to the community and seeking local financial support. This bill builds on that success by again requiring the local community to put in place such a system. The committee was also sensitive to comments from the field that requiring surveys can be very costly and that collecting existing data can be as effective and more cost-efficient. The committee included language giving coalitions the flexibility to use such existing data.

The bill sets out limitations on the award of grants. All awards under this program are capped at \$100,000. This was based on fiscal restraints at the Federal level and information collected from coalitions throughout the country. In fact, testimony indicated that coalitions around the country can benefit from very small grant awards. Ronda Kopelke from the North Woods Coalition in Marshfield, Wisconsin wrote, "if you have Federal support based on community buy-in, then it can help us leverage support from the community. A small grant from the Federal Government—even \$5,000—could enable our coalition to build a regional youth alliance, send youth to camp to learn drug and alcohol strategies and to hire a part-time person to marshal the volunteers necessary to sustain the effort over time." Karen Hoff, director of the Clean Focus Coalition in Charles Town, West Virginia, is implementing a peer mediation program which helps kids resist peer pressure to take drugs and teaches them life-enhancing decision-making skills. This program could be up and running with less than \$5,000. With just \$2,000 from the Federal Government, a locally supported parent education program could be expanded to reach 1,000 parents in the Charles Town area.

The bill also generally limits grant awards to one eligible coalition that represents a community. The goal is to provide financial incentives to encourage every sector of a community to work together. If an infrastructure of community-based anti-drug efforts is going to be created in every region of the country, local efforts must collaborate with one another. Multiple coalitions serving a community may qualify for matching grants if they independently meet the program's criteria and demonstrate that they are collaborating with one another. The bill also recognizes that urban areas with high population densities may have numerous coalitions representing them. Finally, the bill recognizes the unique challenges that rural areas face. A rural community may not be able to meet all of the criteria outlined in the bill. Distances that must be traveled, sectors that may not be represented, and local data that may not be available are all challenges that rural communities often face. The bill gives the Administrator flexibility in reviewing grant applications from rural coalitions so that good-faith efforts that have a likelihood of success can receive support from the Federal Government. One requirement that is not waivable, however, is the provision of matching grant. While a rural coalition may not meet all of the criteria outlined in the bill, the Federal Government will

only provide financial support up to the amount generated by the rural coalition.

The committee received information indicating that, in rare instances, anti-drug coalitions applied for Federal support and did not use the funds for anti-drug activities. Because of this possibility or the potential for a coalition to fail to continue to meet significant criteria of the program, the bill includes a provision to permit the Administrator to suspend a grant.

F. INFORMATION COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION WITH RESPECT TO GRANT RECIPIENTS (SEC. 1033)

The committee received testimony indicating that Federal support provided to communities under other programs often included onerous reporting requirements. Marilyn Culp, executive director of the highly successful Miami Coalition covering 1.8 million people in Miami, Florida, stated that under the current CSAP Community Partnership program the Federal reporting requirements are so cumbersome, that she had to hire a person just to comply with those requirements. Obviously, coalitions want and need to use their scarce resources on efforts to reduce substance abuse in their communities. The bill provides that the Administrator shall minimize reporting requirements by a grant recipient and expedite renewal requests to maximize the most efficient use of resources. The bill intentionally sets a high threshold for applicants to meet so that coalitions with a high likelihood of making an impact are funded and ongoing reporting requirements can be kept to a minimum.

G. ESTABLISHMENT OF ADVISORY COMMISSION (SEC. 1041)

The bill establishes an Advisory Commission to make recommendations to the Director so that the Federal program continues to be responsive to local community needs. The bill reflects the belief that those working on the front lines of the drug problem will be able to offer valuable input to those administering the program. The Advisory Commission membership will ensure that representatives from local communities, the States and national experts are able to provide input. A key focus of the bill is on drug prevention. The qualifications outlined for members of the Advisory Commission reflect this focus.

The following is a section-by-section summary of the bill as reported:

SECTION. 1 SHORT TITLE

The short title of this bill is the "Drug-Free Communities Act of 1997".

SEC. 2. NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAM

This section labels the current act, the National Narcotics Leadership Act of 1988, as "Chapter 1—Office of National Drug Control Policy;" and adds at the end a second chapter, "Chapter 2—Drug-Free Communities.'

SEC. 1021. FINDINGS

Youth substance abuse is rising dramatically, is the cause of other social problems, and is a preventable behavior and a treatable disease; community anti-drug coalitions are implementing comprehensive, long-term strategies to reduce substance abuse; and national, State and local leadership and coordination are critical to help reduce substance abuse.

SEC. 1022. PURPOSES

This section is designed to help reduce substance abuse by strengthening collaboration among communities and all levels of Government, to serve as a catalyst for increased citizen participation among all sectors of a community, to re-channel existing resources from the Federal drug control budget to provide technical assistance and financial support to communities that first demonstrate a long-term commitment to reduce substance abuse among youth, and to encourage the creation of and support for community anti-drug coalitions.

SEC. 1023. DEFINITIONS

“Substance Abuse” means: 1) the illegal use or abuse of drugs, including substances listed on the schedules of the Controlled Substances Act; 2) the abuse of inhalants; or 3) the use of alcohol, tobacco, or other related product as such use is prohibited by State or local law.

SEC. 1024. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

This provision authorizes the following amounts to be appropriated to the Office of National Drug Control Policy \$10 million (FY 1998), \$20 million (FY 1999), \$30 million (FY 2000), \$40 million (FY 2001) and \$43.5 million (FY 2002). This provision also limits administrative costs to 10 percent in FY 1998, decreasing to 3 percent in 2002.

SUBCHAPTER I—DRUG-FREE COMMUNITIES SUPPORT PROGRAM

SEC. 1031. ESTABLISHMENT OF DRUG-FREE COMMUNITIES SUPPORT PROGRAM

The Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy establishes a program to make and track grants to grant recipients, and to provide for technical assistance, data collection, and dissemination of information on state-of-the-art practices. The Director appoints an Administrator to carry out the program. The Director may employ necessary staff and may enter into contracts or agreements to delegate authority for activities to carry out the program.

SEC. 1032. PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION

This provision sets out eligibility criteria and grant amounts. To qualify for a grant, the program requires: (1) an application; (2) that one or more representatives of the major sectors of a community, including, if applicable, the single State authority for substance abuse and, if feasible, an elected official from local or tribal, State and the Federal Government, are involved in the coalition;

(3) the coalition to have been in existence for at least 6 months, with substantial voluntary participation especially among individuals involved with youth; (4) a focused mission and strategies; (5) that the coalition can be sustained as an ongoing concern with non-Federal financial support; and, (6) a system to evaluate outcomes. Grants may be made to a coalition representing a community up to the amount of non-Federal funds raised by a coalition, including in-kind contributions. No grant may exceed \$100,000. Grants may be made to more than one coalition representing a community if the coalitions are cooperating and independently meet the criteria above. Coalitions representing a rural county with less than 30,000 people that may not be able to meet all of the criteria above can receive up to \$100,000 in Federal matching funds. Grants will be executed using a peer review process. In all cases, grants may be suspended, after notice and an opportunity to appeal, if a grant recipient fails to continue to meet the required criteria, and renewed for 4 consecutive years if a coalition continues to meet the criteria in each such year.

SEC. 1033. INFORMATION COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION WITH RESPECT TO GRANT RECIPIENTS

This provision gives the Administrator general auditing authority, requires the issuance of a request for proposal regarding the application, grant awards, renewals, and the suspension or withholding of grants. The provision also requires the Administrator to minimize reporting burdens consistent with existing law. It also provides authority for the collection and dissemination of information and evaluation of the program.

SEC. 1034. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

This provision gives the Administrator the authority to offer training and technical assistance to coalitions and provides contract and agreement authority to assist the Administrator's efforts.

Subchapter II—Advisory Commission

SEC. 1041. ESTABLISHMENT OF ADVISORY COMMISSION

This section establishes an Advisory Commission on Drug-Free Communities.

SEC. 1042 DUTIES

This section provides that the Advisory Commission makes recommendations to the Director on the selection of an Administrator, the award of grants and contracts, and the policies and criteria of the program. The Advisory Commission may also collect information on substance abuse initiatives and programs, appoint subcommittees, and convene workshops and conferences. If the Director rejects a recommendation of the Advisory Commission, the Director must notify the Advisory Commission within 15 days of the reasons for such rejection.

SEC. 1043 MEMBERSHIP

This section requires that the President appoints 11 Members to the Advisory Commission: 4 from the general public that shall include leaders in the fields of youth development, public policy, law or business, or non-profit or private foundations that fund substance abuse programs; 4 from leading representatives of national substance abuse reduction organizations (3 of whom must have extensive training or experience in drug prevention); and 3 from leading representatives of substance abuse reduction in the States. The Advisory Commission elects a chair and may include two ex officio members appointed by the Director.

SEC. 1044 COMPENSATION

This provision provides that the members of the Advisory Commission shall receive for each day they are performing Commission duties compensation at rates not to exceed the daily equivalent to the annual rate of basic pay payable for GS-10 of the General Schedule and travel expenses.

SEC. 1045 TERMS OF OFFICE

This section provides for 3 year terms of office for members of the Advisory Commission on a staggered basis.

SEC. 1046 MEETINGS

This section requires that the Advisory Commission meets at the request of the Chair, a majority of members, or at a request of Director or Administrator. Six members are needed for a quorum.

SEC. 1047 STAFF

The Administrator must make available to the Advisory Commission adequate staff, information and other assistance.

SEC. 1048. TERMINATION

This section provides for termination of the Advisory Commission at the end of fiscal year 2002.

VI. COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XI

Pursuant to rule XI, clause 2(1)(3)(A) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, under the authority of rule X, clause 2(b)(1) and clause 3(f), the results and findings from committee oversight activities are incorporated in the bill and this report.

VII. STATEMENT OF CBO COST ESTIMATE

Pursuant to rule XI, clause 2(1)(3)(c) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee was provided the following estimate of the cost of H.R. 956 prepared by the Congressional Budget Office.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

H.R. 956—Drug-Free Communities Act of 1997

Summary: H.R. 956 would direct the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) to establish a federal program to assist local communities in developing and implementing programs to prevent and treat substance abuse by minors. The bill would authorize annual matching grants of up to \$100,000 to programs that meet the bill's eligibility requirements. In addition, the bill would require that ONDCP select a federal agency to administer the programs, which would include awarding and tracking grants and providing technical assistance and training to approved communities.

H.R. 956 also would establish the Advisory Commission on Drug-Free Communities, which would work with ONDCP in establishing and implementing the federal program created by the bill, including recommending which federal agency should make the grants and which localities should receive grants under the bill. The President would appoint the commission's 11 members. The bill would authorize that members who are not employees or officers of the federal government receive compensation for time spent performing commission duties. All members would be reimbursed for travel expenses. The commission would terminate at the end of fiscal year 2002.

To cover its costs, H.R. 956 would authorize the appropriation of \$143.5 million over the 1998–2002 period. Of that total, the bill would limit the amount spent on administrative costs to \$5.9 million. Because the bill would not affect direct spending or receipts, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply. H.R. 956 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington DC, May 19, 1997.

Hon. DAN BURTON,
*Chairman, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, House
of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 956, the Drug-Free Communities Act of 1997.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contacts are John R. Righter (for federal costs) and Theresa Gullo (for the state and local impact).

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL, *Director.*

Enclosure:

Estimated cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of H.R. 956 is shown in the table below. For the purposes of this estimate, CBO assumes that all amounts authorized in H.R. 956 would be appropriated by the start of each fiscal year. Outlays are estimated based on the bill's requirements, the experience of other federal grant programs, and information provided by ONDCP.

(By fiscal year, in millions of dollars)

	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION					
Authorization level	10	20	30	40	44
Estimated outlays	2	14	24	33	41

The costs of this legislation fall within budget function 800 (general government).

Pay-as-you-go considerations: None.

Estimated impact on State, local, and tribal governments: The bill contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in UMRA and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments. Community coalitions (including state, local, and tribal governments) that choose to apply for grants under the program established by this bill would be required to comply with certain application and operating procedures including matching 100 percent of the federal funds they receive. These grant recipients would also be eligible for technical assistance and training to be provided by ONDCP.

Estimated impact on the private sector: The bill would impose no new private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA.

Estimate prepared by: Federal Cost—John R. Righter; impact on State, local, and tribal governments: Theresa Gullo.

Estimate approved by: Paul N. Van de Water, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

VIII. STATEMENT OF CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

Pursuant to rule XI, clause 2(1)(4) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds that Congress is specifically granted the power to enact this law under Article I, Section 8, clause 1 under which Congress is granted the “Power To * * * provide for the * * * general Welfare of the United States[.]”

IX. FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT (5 U.S.C. APP.) SECTION 5(b)

A. Pursuant to Section 5(b) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, the Committee has determined that the functions of the Advisory Commission on Drug-Free Communities established by H.R. 956, section 1041(a) are not being and could not be performed by an existing agency or advisory committee.

B. Subchapter II of H.R. 956 meets the specific requirements of Section 5(b) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

1. The purpose of the Advisory Commission on Drug-Free Communities is clearly defined in section 1041(b).

2. The membership of the Advisory Commission, as set out in section 1043, provides for a fair balance in terms of the points of view represented and the functions to be performed by the Advisory Commission.

3. Section 1042(a) provides for self-recusal to eliminate any conflict of interest and insure that the advice and recommendations of the advisory committee will not be inappropriately influenced by the appointing authority or by any special interest, but will instead be the result of the advisory committee’s independent judgment.

4. Section 1024 authorizes appropriations for the Drug-Free Communities Act including Subchapter II on the Advisory Commission.

5. Section 1047 provides for adequate staff and other resources for the Commission.

X. CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

NATIONAL NARCOTICS LEADERSHIP ACT OF 1988

TITLE I—COORDINATION OF NATIONAL DRUG POLICY

Subtitle A—National Drug Control Program

SEC. 1001. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “National Narcotics Leadership Act of 1988”.

CHAPTER 1—OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY

SEC. 1002. ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE.—There is established in the Executive Office of the President the “Office of National Drug Control Policy”.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 2—DRUG-FREE COMMUNITIES

SEC. 1021. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) *Substance abuse among youth has more than doubled in the 5-year period preceding 1996, with substantial increases in the use of marijuana, inhalants, cocaine, methamphetamine, LSD, and heroin.*

(2) *The most dramatic increases in substance abuse has occurred among 13- and 14-year-olds.*

(3) *Casual or periodic substance abuse by youth today will contribute to hard core or chronic substance abuse by the next generation of adults.*

(4) *Substance abuse is at the core of other problems, such as rising violent teenage and violent gang crime, increasing health care costs, HIV infections, teenage pregnancy, high school drop-outs, and lower economic productivity.*

(5) *Increases in substance abuse among youth are due in large part to an erosion of understanding by youth of the high risks associated with substance abuse, and to the softening of peer norms against use.*

(6)(A) *Substance abuse is a preventable behavior and a treatable disease; and*

(B)(i) *during the 13-year period beginning with 1979, monthly use of illegal drugs among youth 12 to 17 years of age declined by over 70 percent; and*

(ii) *data suggests that if parents would simply talk to their children regularly about the dangers of substance abuse, use among youth could be expected to decline by as much as 30 percent.*

(7) *Community anti-drug coalitions throughout the United States are successfully developing and implementing comprehensive, long-term strategies to reduce substance abuse among youth on a sustained basis.*

(8) *Intergovernmental cooperation and coordination through national, State, and local or tribal leadership and partnerships are critical to facilitate the reduction of substance abuse among youth in communities throughout the United States.*

SEC. 1022. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this chapter are—

(1) *to reduce substance abuse among youth in communities throughout the United States, and over time, to reduce substance abuse among adults;*

(2) *to strengthen collaboration among communities, the Federal Government, and State, local, and tribal governments;*

(3) *to enhance intergovernmental cooperation and coordination on the issue of substance abuse among youth;*

(4) *to serve as a catalyst for increased citizen participation and greater collaboration among all sectors and organizations of a community that first demonstrates a long-term commitment to reducing substance abuse among youth;*

(5) *to rechannel resources from the fiscal year 1998 Federal drug control budget to provide technical assistance, guidance, and financial support to communities that demonstrate a long-term commitment in reducing substance abuse among youth;*

(6) *to disseminate to communities timely information regarding the state-of-the-art practices and initiatives that have proven to be effective in reducing substance abuse among youth;*

(7) *to enhance, not supplant, local community initiatives for reducing substance abuse among youth; and*

(8) *to encourage the creation of and support for community anti-drug coalitions throughout the United States.*

SEC. 1023. DEFINITIONS.

In this chapter:

(1) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—*The term “Administrator” means the Administrator appointed by the Director under section 1031(c).*

(2) **ADVISORY COMMISSION.**—*The term “Advisory Commission” means the Advisory Commission established under section 1041.*

(3) *COMMUNITY*.—The term “community” shall have the meaning provided that term by the Administrator, in consultation with the Advisory Commission.

(4) *DIRECTOR*.—The term “Director” means the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

(5) *ELIGIBLE COALITION*.—The term “eligible coalition” means a coalition that meets the applicable criteria under section 1032(a).

(6) *GRANT RECIPIENT*.—The term “grant recipient” means the recipient of a grant award under section 1032.

(7) *NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION*.—The term “nonprofit organization” means an organization described under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(8) *PROGRAM*.—The term “Program” means the program established under section 1031(a).

(9) *SUBSTANCE ABUSE*.—The term “substance abuse” means—

(A) the illegal use or abuse of drugs, including substances listed in schedules I through V of section 112 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 812);

(B) the abuse of inhalants; or

(C) the use of alcohol, tobacco, or other related product as such use is prohibited by State or local law.

(10) *YOUTH*.—The term “youth” shall have the meaning provided that term by the Administrator, in consultation with the Advisory Commission.

SEC. 1024. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) *IN GENERAL*.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Office of National Drug Control Policy to carry out this chapter—

(1) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1998;

(2) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 1999;

(3) \$30,000,000 for fiscal year 2000;

(4) \$40,000,000 for fiscal year 2001; and

(5) \$43,500,000 for fiscal year 2002.

(b) *ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS*.—Not more than the following percentages of the amounts authorized under subsection (a) may be used to pay administrative costs:

(1) 10 percent for fiscal year 1998.

(2) 6 percent for fiscal year 1999.

(3) 4 percent for fiscal year 2000.

(4) 3 percent for fiscal year 2001.

(5) 3 percent for fiscal year 2002.

Subchapter I—Drug-Free Communities Support Program

SEC. 1031. ESTABLISHMENT OF DRUG-FREE COMMUNITIES SUPPORT PROGRAM.

(a) *ESTABLISHMENT*.—The Director shall establish a program to support communities in the development and implementation of comprehensive, long-term plans and programs to prevent and treat substance abuse among youth.

(b) *PROGRAM*.—In carrying out the Program, the Director shall—

(1) make and track grants to grant recipients;

(2) provide for technical assistance and training, data collection, and dissemination of information on state-of-the-art practices that the Director determines to be effective in reducing substance abuse; and

(3) provide for the general administration of the Program.

(c) **ADMINISTRATION.**—Not later than 30 days after receiving recommendations from the Advisory Commission under section 1042(a)(1), the Director shall appoint an Administrator to carry out the Program.

(d) **CONTRACTING.**—The Director may employ any necessary staff and may enter into contracts or agreements with national drug control agencies, including interagency agreements to delegate authority for the execution of grants and for such other activities necessary to carry out this chapter.

SEC. 1032. PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION.

(a) **GRANT ELIGIBILITY.**—To be eligible to receive an initial grant or a renewal grant under this subchapter, a coalition shall meet each of the following criteria:

(1) **APPLICATION.**—The coalition shall submit an application to the Administrator in accordance with section 1033(a)(2).

(2) **MAJOR SECTOR INVOLVEMENT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The coalition shall consist of 1 or more representatives of each of the following categories:

- (i) Youth.
- (ii) Parents.
- (iii) Businesses.
- (iv) The media.
- (v) Schools.
- (vi) Organizations serving youth.
- (vii) Law enforcement.
- (viii) Religious organizations.
- (ix) Civic, volunteer, and fraternal groups.
- (x) Health care professionals.
- (xi) State, local, or tribal governmental agencies with expertise in the field of substance abuse (including, if applicable, the State authority with primary authority for substance abuse).
- (xii) Other organizations involved in reducing substance abuse.

(B) **ELECTED OFFICIALS.**—If feasible, in addition to representatives from the categories listed in subparagraph (A), the coalition shall have an elected official (or a representative of an elected official) from—

- (i) the Federal Government; and
- (ii) the government of the appropriate State and political subdivision thereof or the governing body or an Indian tribe (as that term is defined in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e))).

(C) **REPRESENTATION.**—An individual who is a member of the coalition may serve on the coalition as a representative of not more than 1 category listed under subparagraph (A).

(3) **COMMITMENT.**—The coalition shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Administrator—

(A) that the representatives of the coalition have worked together on substance abuse reduction initiatives, which, at a minimum, includes initiatives that target drugs referenced in section 1023(9)(A), for a period of not less than 6 months, acting through entities such as task forces, subcommittees, or community boards; and

(B) substantial participation from volunteer leaders in the community involved (especially in cooperation with individuals involved with youth such as parents, teachers, coaches, youth workers, and members of the clergy).

(4) *MISSION AND STRATEGIES.*—The coalition shall, with respect to the community involved—

(A) have as its principal mission the reduction of substance abuse, which, at a minimum, includes the use and abuse of drugs referenced in section 1023(9)(A), in a comprehensive and long-term manner, with a primary focus on youth in the community;

(B) describe and document the nature and extent of the substance abuse problem, which, at a minimum, includes the use and abuse of drugs referenced in section 1023(9)(A), in the community;

(C)(i) provide a description of substance abuse prevention and treatment programs and activities, which, at a minimum, includes programs and activities relating to the use and abuse of drugs referenced in section 1023(9)(A), in existence at the time of the grant application; and

(ii) identify substance abuse programs and service gaps, which, at a minimum, includes programs and gaps relating to the use and abuse of drugs referenced in section 1023(9)(A), in the community;

(D) develop a strategic plan to reduce substance abuse among youth, which, at a minimum, includes the use and abuse of drugs referenced in section 1023(9)(A), in a comprehensive and long-term fashion; and

(E) work to develop a consensus regarding the priorities of the community to combat substance abuse among youth, which, at a minimum, includes the use and abuse of drugs referenced in section 1023(9)(A).

(5) *SUSTAINABILITY.*—The coalition shall demonstrate that the coalition is an ongoing concern by demonstrating that the coalition—

(A) is—

(i)(I) a nonprofit organization; or

(II) an entity that the Administrator determines to be appropriate; or

(ii) part of, or is associated with, an established legal entity;

(B) receives financial support (including, in the discretion of the Administrator, in-kind contributions) from non-Federal sources; and

(C) has a strategy to solicit substantial financial support from non-Federal sources to ensure that the coalition and the programs operated by the coalition are self-sustaining.

(6) *ACCOUNTABILITY.*—The coalition shall—

- (A) *establish a system to measure and report outcomes—*
 - (i) *consistent with common indicators and evaluation protocols established by the Administrator; and*
 - (ii) *approved by the Administrator;*
 - (B) *conduct—*
 - (i) *for an initial grant under this subchapter, an initial benchmark survey of drug use among youth (or use local surveys or performance measures available or accessible in the community at the time of the grant application); and*
 - (ii) *biennial surveys (or incorporate local surveys in existence at the time of the evaluation) to measure the progress and effectiveness of the coalition; and*
 - (C) *provide assurances that the entity conducting an evaluation under this paragraph, or from which the coalition receives information, has experience—*
 - (i) *in gathering data related to substance abuse among youth; or*
 - (ii) *in evaluating the effectiveness of community anti-drug coalitions.*
- (b) *GRANT AMOUNTS.—*
- (1) *IN GENERAL.—*
- (A) *GRANTS.—*
- (i) *IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (iv), for a fiscal year, the Administrator may grant to an eligible coalition under this paragraph, an amount not to exceed the amount of non-Federal funds raised by the coalition, including in-kind contributions, for that fiscal year.*
 - (ii) *SUSPENSION OF GRANTS.—If such grant recipient fails to continue to meet the criteria specified in subsection (a), the Administrator may suspend the grant, after providing written notice to the grant recipient and an opportunity to appeal.*
 - (iii) *RENEWAL GRANTS.—Subject to clause (iv), the Administrator may award a renewal grant to a grant recipient under this subparagraph for each fiscal year following the fiscal year for which an initial grant is awarded, in an amount not to exceed the amount of non-Federal funds raised by the coalition, including in-kind contributions, for that fiscal year, during the 4-year period following the period of the initial grant.*
 - (iv) *LIMITATION.—The amount of a grant award under this subparagraph may not exceed \$100,000 for a fiscal year.*
- (B) *COALITION AWARDS.—*
- (i) *IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the Administrator may, with respect to a community, make a grant to 1 eligible coalition that represents that community.*
 - (ii) *EXCEPTION.—The Administrator may make a grant to more than 1 eligible coalition that represents a community if—*
 - (I) *the eligible coalitions demonstrate that the coalitions are collaborating with one another; and*

(II) each of the coalitions has independently met the requirements set forth in subsection (a).

(2) **RURAL COALITION GRANTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—In addition to awarding grants under paragraph (1), to stimulate the development of coalitions in sparsely populated and rural areas, the Administrator, in consultation with the Advisory Commission, may award a grant in accordance with this section to a coalition that represents a county with a population that does not exceed 30,000 individuals. In awarding a grant under this paragraph, the Administrator may waive any requirement under subsection (a) if the Administrator considers that waiver to be appropriate.

(ii) **MATCHING REQUIREMENT.**—Subject to subparagraph (C), for a fiscal year, the Administrator may grant to an eligible coalition under this paragraph, an amount not to exceed the amount of non-Federal funds raised by the coalition, including in-kind contributions, for that fiscal year.

(iii) **SUSPENSION OF GRANTS.**—If such grant recipient fails to continue to meet any criteria specified in subsection (a) that has not been waived by the Administrator pursuant to clause (i), the Administrator may suspend the grant, after providing written notice to the grant recipient and an opportunity to appeal.

(B) **RENEWAL GRANTS.**—The Administrator may award a renewal grant to an eligible coalition that is a grant recipient under this paragraph for each fiscal year following the fiscal year for which an initial grant is awarded, in an amount not to exceed the amount of non-Federal funds raised by the coalition, including in-kind contributions, during the 4-year period following the period of the initial grant.

(C) **LIMITATIONS.**—

(i) **AMOUNT.**—The amount of a grant award under this paragraph shall not exceed \$100,000 for a fiscal year.

(ii) **AWARDS.**—With respect to a county referred to in subparagraph (A), the Administrator may award a grant under this section to not more than 1 eligible coalition that represents the county.

SEC. 1033. INFORMATION COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION WITH RESPECT TO GRANT RECIPIENTS.

(a) **COALITION INFORMATION.**—

(1) **GENERAL AUDITING AUTHORITY.**—For the purpose of audit and examination, the Administrator—

(A) shall have access to any books, documents, papers, and records that are pertinent to any grant or grant renewal request under this chapter; and

(B) may periodically request information from a grant recipient to ensure that the grant recipient meets the applicable criteria under section 1032(a).

(2) *APPLICATION PROCESS.*—The Administrator shall issue a request for proposal regarding, with respect to the grants awarded under section 1032, the application process, grant renewal, and suspension or withholding of renewal grants. Each application under this paragraph shall be in writing and shall be subject to review by the Administrator.

(3) *REPORTING.*—The Administrator shall, to the maximum extent practicable and in a manner consistent with applicable law, minimize reporting requirements by a grant recipient and expedite any application for a renewal grant made under this subchapter.

(b) *DATA COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Administrator may collect data from—

(A) national substance abuse organizations that work with eligible coalitions, community anti-drug coalitions, departments or agencies of the Federal Government, or State or local governments and the governing bodies of Indian tribes; and

(B) any other entity or organization that carries out activities that relate to the purposes of the Program.

(2) *ACTIVITIES OF ADMINISTRATOR.*—The Administrator may—

(A) evaluate the utility of specific initiatives relating to the purposes of the Program;

(B) conduct an evaluation of the Program; and

(C) disseminate information described in this subsection to—

(i) eligible coalitions and other substance abuse organizations; and

(ii) the general public.

SEC. 1034. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—

(1) *TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND AGREEMENTS.*—With respect to any grant recipient or other organization, the Administrator may—

(A) offer technical assistance and training; and

(B) enter into contracts and cooperative agreements.

(2) *COORDINATION OF PROGRAMS.*—The Administrator may facilitate the coordination of programs between a grant recipient and other organizations and entities.

(b) *TRAINING.*—The Administrator may provide training to any representative designated by a grant recipient in—

(1) coalition building;

(2) task force development;

(3) mediation and facilitation, direct service, assessment and evaluation; or

(4) any other activity related to the purposes of the Program.

Subchapter II—Advisory Commission

SEC. 1041. ESTABLISHMENT OF ADVISORY COMMISSION.

(a) *ESTABLISHMENT.*—There is established a commission to be known as the “Advisory Commission on Drug-Free Communities”.

(b) *PURPOSE.*—The Advisory Commission shall advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Director concerning matters related to the activities carried out under the Program.

SEC. 1042. DUTIES.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Advisory Commission—

(1) shall, not later than 30 days after its first meeting, make recommendations to the Director regarding the selection of an Administrator;

(2) may make recommendations to the Director regarding any grant, contract, or cooperative agreement made by the Program;

(3) may make recommendations to the Director regarding the activities of the Program;

(4) may make recommendations to the Director regarding any policy or criteria established by the Director to carry out the Program;

(5) may—

(A) collect, by correspondence or by personal investigation, information concerning initiatives, studies, services, programs, or other activities of coalitions or organizations working in the field of substance abuse in the United States or any other country; and

(B) with the approval of the Director, make the information referred to in subparagraph (A) available through appropriate publications or other methods for the benefit of eligible coalitions and the general public; and

(6) may appoint subcommittees and convene workshops and conferences.

(b) *RECOMMENDATIONS.*—If the Director rejects any recommendation of the Advisory Commission under subsection (a)(1), the Director shall notify the Advisory Commission in writing of the reasons for the rejection not later than 15 days after receiving the recommendation.

(c) *CONFLICT OF INTEREST.*—A member of the Advisory Commission shall recuse himself or herself from any decision that would constitute a conflict of interest.

SEC. 1043. MEMBERSHIP.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The President shall appoint 11 members to the Advisory Commission as follows:

(1) 4 members shall be appointed from the general public and shall include leaders—

(A) in fields of youth development, public policy, law, or business; or

(B) of nonprofit organizations or private foundations that fund substance abuse programs.

(2) 4 members shall be appointed from the leading representatives of national substance abuse reduction organizations, of which no fewer than 3 members shall have extensive training or experience in drug prevention.

(3) 3 members shall be appointed from the leading representatives of State substance abuse reduction organizations.

(b) *CHAIRPERSON.*—The Advisory Commission shall elect a chairperson or co-chairpersons from among its members.

(c) *EX OFFICIO MEMBERS.*—The ex officio membership of the Advisory Commission shall consist of any 2 officers or employees of the United States that the Director determines to be necessary for the Advisory Commission to effectively carry out its functions.

SEC. 1044. COMPENSATION.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Members of the Advisory Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall not receive any additional compensation for service on the Advisory Commission. The remaining members of the Advisory Commission shall receive, for each day (including travel time) that they are engaged in the performance of the functions of the Advisory Commission, compensation at rates not to exceed the daily equivalent to the annual rate of basic pay payable for grade GS-10 of the General Schedule.

(b) *TRAVEL EXPENSES.*—Each member of the Advisory Commission shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with sections 5702 and 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 1045. TERMS OF OFFICE.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Subject to subsection (b), the term of office of a member of the Advisory Commission shall be 3 years, except that, as designated at the time of appointment—

(1) of the initial members appointed under section 1043(a)(1), 2 shall be appointed for a term of 2 years;

(2) of the initial members appointed under section 1043(a)(2), 2 shall be appointed for a term of 2 years; and

(3) of the initial members appointed under section 1043(a)(3), 1 shall be appointed for a term of 1 year.

(b) *VACANCIES.*—Any member appointed to fill a vacancy for an unexpired term of a member shall serve for the remainder of the unexpired term. A member of the Advisory Commission may serve after the expiration of such member's term until a successor has been appointed and taken office.

SEC. 1046. MEETINGS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—After its initial meeting, the Advisory Commission shall meet, with the advanced approval of the Administrator, at the call of the Chairperson (or Co-chairpersons) of the Advisory Commission or a majority of its members or upon the request of the Director or Administrator of the Program.

(b) *QUORUM.*—6 members of the Advisory Commission shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 1047. STAFF.

The Administrator shall make available to the Advisory Commission adequate staff, information, and other assistance.

SEC. 1048. TERMINATION.

The Advisory Commission shall terminate at the end of fiscal year 2002.

XI. CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT; PUBLIC LAW 104-1

The committee finds that the legislation does not relate to the terms and conditions of employment or access to public services or accommodations within the meaning of section 102(b)(3) of the Congressional Accountability Act (PL 104-1).

XII. BUDGET ANALYSIS

Pursuant to rule XI, clause 2(1)(3)(B), and Section 308(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the committee finds that no new budget authority, new spending authority, new credit authority or an increase or decrease in revenues or tax expenditures results from enactment of this resolution.

XIII. UNFUNDED MANDATES REFORM ACT; PUBLIC LAW 104-4, SECTION 423

The committee finds that the legislation does not impose any Federal mandates within the meaning of section 423 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (P.L. 104-4).

XIV. A P P E N D I X

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, May 19, 1997.

Hon. DAN BURTON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On May 16, 1997, your Committee ordered reported H.R. 956, the Drug-Free Community Act. My Committee received a named additional referral on that measure when it was introduced on March 5, 1997, and subsequently referred the bill to the Commerce Committee Subcommittee on Health and Environment on March 14, 1997.

It is my understanding that, under the terms of Section 1031(d), the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) could qualify for an interagency agreement for the execution of grants. Based on this understanding of the bill, I will agree to allow the Commerce Committee to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 956. I would appreciate knowing whether your interpretation of the legislation is consistent with mine.

By agreeing to be discharged, this Committee assists you in expediting consideration of this measure on the House Floor. However, the Commerce Committee does not waive future jurisdictional claims to this bill or other measures addressing the same issues. In fact, I hope to have your support of my effort to seek conferees on this or a companion Senate bill should a House-Senate conference be convened on this legislation.

I would appreciate you including this letter as a part of the Government Reform and Oversight Committee's Report on H.R. 956, and as part of the Record during consideration of this bill by the House.

Sincerely,

TOM BLILEY, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT,
Washington, DC, May 19, 1997.

Hon. TOM BLILEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding your Committee's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 956, the Drug-Free Communities Act.

I acknowledge your interest in this legislation, based on the Commerce Committee's named additional referral, and appreciate your cooperation in moving the bill to the House floor expeditiously. Your interpretation of the legislation, as put forth in your letter, is correct, and I agree that your decision to forgo further action on the bill will not prejudice the Commerce Committee with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar provisions.

Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DAN BURTON, *Chairman.*

○